



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/693,245	10/20/2000	John M. Haltmeyer		8230
7590 05/17/2004			EXAMINER	
Royal W. Craig Law Offices of Royal W. Craig 210 N. Charles St., Suite 1319 Baltimore, MD 21201			REITZ, KARL	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2624	

DATE MAILED: 05/17/2004

2

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/693,245

Applicant(s)

HALTMEYER, JOHN M.

Examiner

Karl R. Reitz

Art Unit

2624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 October 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 October 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gase (5,580,177) and Montague (5,675,782).

3. In accordance with claim 1, Gase disclose a method for managing printers in a network environment; in Gase's system, file server 16 (figure 1) manages printers 18, 20, 22 (col. 3 lines 51-54).

4. Gase further discloses executing a configuration routine for each printer which checks whether a printer driver is installed for each authorized print and if not install the printer driver; in Gase's system memory 34 in file server 16 contains the most updated version of all the printer's drivers and when a user selects a printer to print on, the server 16 determines whether the driver is the most updated driver (col. 4 lines 10-19). If it is not the most updated driver, the server 16 automatically installs the most updated driver on the client computer 10, 12 and 14 (col. 4 lines 20-26). This process is performed for all clients 10, 12 and 14 and all printers (col. 4 lines 10-26).

5. However, Gase does not disclose expressly defining all groups that a user belongs to when the user logs onto the network, or querying the printer database to establish all printers that have been assigned.

6. Montague discloses a method for controlling access to an entity (which includes a printer as stated on col. 1 lines 13-17) by determining which trustee (user) is allowed to access which entity (col. 2 lines 57-62).

7. Gase and Montague are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely controlling printing in a network setting.

8. Therefore, at the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, to combine the automatic driver installation capability of Gase's system with the group access and restriction capabilities of Montague's system.

9. The motivation for doing so would have been to a) ensure the proper and most recent printer utility is used in printing (Gase: col. 2 lines 29-32) and b) ensure that users who should not use certain entities (printers), based on the preferences of the system administrator, are in fact prohibited from using those entities (Montague: col. 1 lines 26-30).

10. In accordance with claims 2 and 3, Gase discloses automatically updating each printer (whether local or network printers), including the client's driver, whenever a user prints to that printer (col. 4 lines 17-26). Montague discloses only allowing authorized users to access each entity, by denying access to unauthorized users (col. 3 lines 18-27).

11. In accordance with claim 4, Gase discloses automatically setting a default printer (col. 3 lines 8-15).

12. In accordance with claim 5, it would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to delete created printer and connections when the user logs off, since they are no

longer needed. This cleaning would allow the system to operate without unnecessarily large storage devices to maintain unneeded settings, further at some point so many users would have logged in and out that some method of deleting the settings would be necessary since storage cannot be unlimited.

Contact Information

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karl R. Reitz whose telephone number is (703) 305-8696. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00-4:30.

14. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K. Moore can be reached on (703) 305-7452. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

15. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



KRR

DAVID MOORE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600